

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

01-184

From: Greg Gillham
To: Mike Powell
Date: Wed, Apr 16, 2003 12:08 PM
Subject: Mobile Telephone number portability concerns

RECEIVED

MAY - 5 2003

Dear FCC Chairman Powell,

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Just a quick note to let the FCC know how important it is for the American Public to have True Mobile Number Portability (Actually I really want to have this option for myself). I just read the following news article on www.news.com

http://news.com.com/2100-1039-996871.html?tag=cd_mh

"Wireless would rather fight than switch"

"update Cell phone companies on Tuesday asked an appeals court to overturn a requirement that cell phone subscribers be allowed to keep the same telephone number when changing carriers."

Please help the FCC do what it can to enforce this Nov. 24 ruling to provide Telephone number portability.

Sincerely,
-Gregory Gillham
10702 Stone Canyon Rd. #206
Dallas, TX 75230
469-556-0273

STOP MORE SPAM with the new MSN 8 and get 2 months FREE*
<http://join.msn.com/?page=features/junkmail>

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List A B C D E

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

01-184

From: Giorgio Galante
To: Mike Powell
Date: 4/16/03 8:37AM
Subject: Keeping phone numbers when switching wireless carriers

RECEIVED

MAY - 5 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Mr. Powell,

I would like to understand why the deadline to force the wireless carriers to give consumers the ability to keep their phone numbers when switching carriers has been pushed back 3 times. Obviously the wireless carriers don't want to give up their phone numbers because at the moment, it's a natural vendor lock-in mechanism. The idea that this will not spur additional competition is completely bogus. What is the current status of this issue and when will it be implemented? Or should I assume this will be dragged out indefinitely and ultimately swept under the rug?

Regards,
Giorgio Galante
716-903-1432
ggalante@adelphia.net

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List A B C D E

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

01-184

From: Moran, David
To: Mike Powell, abernat@fcc.gov, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Thu, Apr 17, 2003 9:28 AM
Subject: Wireless Carriers/Portable Phone Numbers - Re: HoustonChronicle - Wed, Apr 16, Page 4B

Dear Sir/Madame Commissioners,

RECEIVED

MAY - 5 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

After reading an article in the Houston Chronicle (referenced above),
I wanted to volunteer a case history in support of the FCC's findings and
Ruling regarding the portability of telephone numbers between cell phone service providers.

My wife runs a small commercial construction business, located
Just north of Houston, in Southern Montgomery County, Texas.
She lives on her cell phone during business hours, coordinating
Activities of materials suppliers, sub-contractors, customers, etc, etc.
Maintaining her current phone number is absolutely critical
To her operation and, for that matter, her success.
She maintains (5) separate numbers with Verison (in Houston), under all different
"deals". She is powerless to affect any negotiation to leverage/improve
her communication costs, because the assigned cell phone numbers
are not portable, and she cannot realistically, compare services from alternative providers.
She complains constantly of the Service level
(or rather absence) provided by Verison.

It is no wonder to me that Verison are vehemently opposed to portable numbers,
Since it is likely that half of their customers would jump ship the next day.

The non-portability of cell phone numbers, in my opinion, is clearly restraint of trade,
in immaculate black-and-white. This is clearly a barrier to consumers in the marketplace.

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List A B C D E

Can we find out the contacts for the (3) judge panel considering the case?

(3) extensions to implementing the FCC ruling deadline is already abusive.

They have used our dime for long enough.

Thanks & Regards,

David Moran

Director - Applications Development

Smith Bits

Ph (800) 877-6484

Ph (281) 233-5387 (Direct)

Fax (281) 443-0018

dmoran@smith.com

This email is intended solely for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged information. Copying, forwarding or distributing this message by persons or entities other than the addressee is prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please contact the sender immediately and delete the material from any computer. This email may have been monitored for policy compliance. [021216]

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

01-184
RECEIVED

From: Jason Moses
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner
Adelstein
Date: Wed, Apr 16, 2003 1:07 PM
Subject: mobile phone number portability

MAY - 9 2003
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Commissioners;

I am writing to express my strong support for the FCC policy of requiring that mobile phone service providers implement "number portability". I am a small business owner who is very dissatisfied with my mobile service but loath to switch providers, as the change in telephone number would be very disruptive to my business. I feel that not requiring this basic freedom to the consumer allows providers to hold consumers hostage and avoid addressing customer service concerns.

The industry cites a high level of customer turnover as evidence that this rule is not needed. It shocks, baffles and even amuses me that the industry would cite evidence of rampant customer dissatisfaction as justification for preventing customer recourse to this same problem.

I urge you to strongly oppose the wireless industries' new legal challenge to this rule and move ahead as quickly as possible to implement it. Myself and my colleagues have been waiting a very long time for this.

Sincerely

Jason Moses
President, Urban Renewal Landscape Arts

--

Sign-up for your own FREE Personalized E-mail at Mail.com
<http://www.mail.com/?sr=signup>

CC: sf.nancy@mail.house.gov

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List A B C D E

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

01-184

From: JANICE SUE PAVLIK
To: Mike Powell
Date: Thu, Apr 10, 2003 2:18 PM
Subject: CellPhone Numbers

RECEIVED

MAY - 5 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Commissioner Powell:

I work for the Guernsey County Child Support Agency in Cambridge Ohio. We have been trying to secure a list which would contain the Cell Phone Agencies and the 3 didget prefix number that is assigned to them for each area of the country.

A lot of our absent parents now have only cell phones - we can get that number when they call us but are unable to find the resourse needed to determine which company they have service through.

This could prove to be a valuable location tool - as they would have to provide an address and sometimes even employment information when they secure the cellphone services.
and this info could be obtained from the cellphone company to be able to locate and enforce child support orders.

Do yoy know where I can obtain the information ? As I am sure the companies must get licenced and also are provided certain prefix numbers that they use when they set up phone services for these customers.

I would appreciate any help you can give me in securing this information-

Thanks
J. Sue Pavlik
Guernsey County CSEA
P O Box 253
Cambridge, Ohio 43725
pavlij@odjfs.state.oh.us

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List A B C D E

01-184

From: J Buckley
To: Mike Powell
Date: Wed, Apr 23, 2003 11:32 AM
Subject: Transferring A Cell Phone Number Between Carriers

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

The issue of Cell Phone Number Portability has been in and out of the news a number of times. Perhaps the SBC's of the world argue that people will abandon their hard-wire phones for cell phone service exclusively.

Whatever the reasoning the key excuse, in my mind, is for the Cell Phone Providers to hold their customers hostage.

Here in Chicago, as in many other highly populated areas, we've been forced to split area codes with new area code areas and/or overlay area codes. The big Telcom's explain that with pagers, cell phones, fax lines & dedicated internet lines that they are simply "running out of numbers".

People frequently switch Cell Carriers to get a cheaper plan. When they do this they currently obtain a new number. The old number gets put on Hold for a given period of time.

I question how many numbers are in a "Holding" pattern at any given time?

If Cell Phone Numbers Were Portable there would be more numbers available and fewer numbers on Hold.

RECEIVED

MAY - 5 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

STOP MORE SPAM with the new MSN 8 and get 2 months FREE*
<http://join.msn.com/?page=features/junkmail>

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List A B C D E _____

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

01-184

From: Fr. Brian Cavanaugh, TOR
To: Mike Powell
Date: Thu, Apr 17, 2003 8:38 AM
Subject: wireless phone numbers

RECEIVED

MAY - 5 2003

Mr. Powell:

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Greetings and peace! I wish to make my voice be heard as positively in favor of the FCC proposal to allow customers to retain their cell phone number when they change carriers.

Andrew McBride, the attorney representing Verizon Wireless and the Cellular Telecommunications and Internet Association, comment to the U.S. Court of Appeals, "It's very speculative to say this even offers consumer benefits" is absurd. The hassle of changing stationary, business cards, rolodexes, and customers' database more than justifies the FCC proposal.

Do not let them win, please. Thank you.

Peace and blessings,

Fr. Brian Cavanaugh, TOR
Franciscan University
1235 University Blvd.
Steubenville OH 43952

office: 740-283-6317 fax: 740-284-7228
<http://www.appleseeds.org>

In this springtime of faith,
may yours blossom forth
with abundant new life.

Fr. Brian, TOR

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List A B C D E

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

01-184
RECEIVED

MAY - 5 2003

From: Precursor Group - Rudy Baca
To: Mike Powell
Date: Thu, Apr 17, 2003 4:30 PM
Subject: Wireless Number Portability Likely Forces Industry Model Change

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Summary: Precursor advises investors there is much more to Wireless Number Portability (WNP) than meets the eye. Precursor believes the wireless sector is in denial about the very high likelihood the FCCs WNP deadline of November 24th will stick. Furthermore, the appeals court is highly likely (75%) to rule in favor of the FCCs decision to impose WNP. More importantly for investors, WNP is much more than the legalistic and regulatory issues and encouraging churn. Precursor believes WNP is likely to have substantial business model ripple effects and investment aftershocks. Its likely to herald the end of subsidized handsets and long-term contracts and initially spike handset sales. Company Effects: Wireless providers face increased churn and associated increased customer acquisition and retention costs, which will squeeze profitability as lock-in contracts dissipate. Moreover, the ability to keep a wireline number is likely to encourage more customers (now ~3%) to cut the cord and go wireless only. Verizon (VZ) may ultimately benefit by having the best-integrated wireline/wireless network, and ability to bundle and cut prices as needed. AT&T Wireless (AWE) and T-Mobile lack the fallback network resources of a Bell parent. Nextel (NXTL) could benefit by having a differentiated product (PTT) that Precursor believes is too spectrally inefficient for others to implement. Additionally, handset sales are likely to spike as customers change providers having different networks. Nokia could benefit from increased handset sales but likely only new, lower-end phones. Outsourcing is likely to increase as unprepared providers rush to meet the deadline. VeriSigns (VRSN) Illuminet division could get the lions share of any outsourced contracts because it offers turnkey software solutions. (The full research can be accessed by viewing the attached PDF file.)

Registered Clients visit Precursor Research Archives. Forgotten your password? Email websupport@precursorgroup.com or call Daniel Pfenenger at (202) 828-7823.

Rudy L. Baca, Wireless and Media Strategist
The Precursor Group
(202) 828-7800 phone
rbaca@precursorgroup.com
Member NASD/SIPC/Investorside Research Association

If you would prefer not to receive further messages from this sender, please click [here](#) to be removed.

Important: This message is intended for the use of the person(s) ("the Intended Recipient") to whom it is addressed, and it may contain information which is privileged and confidential within the meaning of applicable law. Accordingly dissemination, distribution, copying or other use of this message or any of its contents by any person other than the Intended Recipient may constitute a breach of civil or criminal law and is strictly prohibited. If you are not the Intended Recipient please telephone the sender as soon as possible.

All reasonable precautions have been taken to ensure no viruses are present in this E-mail. We cannot accept responsibility for loss or damage arising from the use of this E-mail or attachments we recommend that you subject these to your virus checking procedures prior to use.

No. of Copies read 0
List A B C D E

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

01-184

From: dow-tdi@attbi.com
To: mpowell@fcc.gov, fcc.gov
Date: Fri, Apr 11, 2003 10:04 PM
Subject: mobile number portability

RECEIVED

MAY - 5 2003

Dear Mr. Powell,

I want to thank the FCC for making such a great effort toward requiring mobile phone companies to allow mobile number portability.

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

I am really looking forward to the FEES that will be ADDED to my monthly bill in order to pay for this feature.

Just what I need, something else that I will have to pay for that neither I nor most non-business consumers want but will be forced to pay for just as we have to pay the portability fee on our land lines.

A few years ago when this fee showed up on my phone bill I wrote Pacific Bell, now SBC, and demanded an explanation.

According to Pacific Bell the reason I have to pay this absurd portability fee on my land lines, even though I have not taken and will never take a phone number with me when I move, (and according to Pacific Bell very few do and the majority of those that do are businesses) is because the FCC allows the phone companies to charge ALL of its customers for this feature whether they want it or will ever use it, instead of charging ONLY those few that do.

By the way if you reply (and I hope you do as I would really love to hear the FCC's logic for my having to pay this fee), please do not give me that undefendable reason recited in Pacific Bell's form letter, which basically said that in order to make this feature available to the incredibly few number of subscribers that will use it everyone has to bear the financial burden to make it affordable for those few that do.

That explanation is as absurd as the fee itself. There is no fee on my phone bill for call-waiting, caller ID, call forwarding, or 3 way calling, among others, all features I do not have or want and which are only charged to those that use them, just as the portability fee should only be charged for both mobile and land lines subscribers who use the feature.

The upcoming case with Verizon and Cingular has caused a lot of traffic on many technology message boards. The overwhelming number of those in favor of portability cite business reasons only. And of course they do not think they should bear the cost for something that, if the responses are a good indication, will be used almost exclusively by businesses and will never be used by the overwhelming majority of non-business subscribers.

And no one, on the boards I have been following, has ever mentioned any interest as a residential customer in having this feature.

Yet once again the non-business consumers will have the financial burden placed on their backs instead of businesses (and the very few non-business subscribers who should have to pay their own way too) which will make up the majority of those few that will even bother to use this feature.

You know not every idea is going to be the greatest thing since sliced cake. No. of Copies rec'd

List A B C D E

If the people at the FCC stayed up with the technology news they would see that everyday some new and great idea is promoted as the next thing that everyone is going to have to have. And 99.99% never take off. Earth to.....

Do us all a favor, try determining if these ideas are really wanted and if those who do want them are going to have to pay for them instead of the rest of us having to give them a free ride as we do now with the land line portability fee.

Regards,

Michael Dow

From: Just So You Know
To: Mike Powell
Date: Thu, Apr 17, 2003 4:09 PM
Subject: Keeping same cell phone number

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

01-184

Good Day,

As a consumer, I would very much appreciate being able to keep my present cell phone number although I may choose to change to a different cell phone company.

Anything the FCC is able to do to insure that consumers will possess this capability as of November 2003, will be greatly appreciated.

Thank you for your time and attention to this matter.

Wishing for you a Wondrous Weekend . . .

peace & blessings ~L

<><>*<>*<>*

Knowledge . . . easily accessible, has proven to be the most effective tool for liberating and empowering my Brothers & Sisters. Accordingly, sharing knowledge is what I feel compelled to do.

~Just So You Know~
jsyk@hotmail.com

"People may forget what you say. And people may forget what you do. However, people will NOT forget how you make them feel."

The new MSN 8: advanced junk mail protection and 2 months FREE*
<http://join.msn.com/?page=features/junkmail>

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, kjmwebb@fcc.gov, Commissioner Adelstein

RECEIVED

MAY - 5 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List A B C D E

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

01-184

RECEIVED

MAY - 5 2003

From: Michael Vitale
To: Mike Powell
Date: Fri, Apr 25, 2003 9:02 AM
Subject: Telephone Number Portability

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Mr. Powell,

Having worked in the Telecom industry for a number of years, I have seen the LEC, RBOC, and wireless companies delay and fight number portability. I hope the FCC stands firm and forces number portability without additional delay.

If true number portability is too much politically, at least the FCC should require mobile phone number portability. It would be a big boost to small businesses and individual customers. It is a shame that we are so far behind Europe and Australia on this issue.

Thank you,
Michael Vitale
res08zu6@verizon.net
727-733-7578

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List A B C D E

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

From: Pauli Gandhi
To: Mike Powell
Date: Wed, Apr 30, 2003 3:36 PM
Subject: Ability to keep the same cell phone number

01-184
RECEIVED

MAY - 5 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Chairman,

This is with regards to an article in CNN about how cell phone companies are suing to block the impending rule, which will allow cell phone customers to keep their number even if they change the provider.

I want to let you know that this a great rule and I urge you to fight these companies that are trying to block a perfectly good rule. The companies don't own the numbers, the customers own the number and the customer must have the right to take the number with them whenever they switch providers.

The companies allege in their lawsuit that the new rule will not be of much use and will only add costs. This is an absolute lie. I for one know several people (including myself) who are using their current plan only because they don't want to go through the hassle of changing numbers and informing everyone.

I urge you not to give in to these cell phone companies and start enforcing the new rule this summer as planned. I also urge you to fight law suits with every possible means so that the customers will continue to benefit from this great rule.

Sincerely,

Pauli Gandhi

Do you Yahoo!?

The New Yahoo! Search - Faster. Easier. Bingo.

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List A B C D E

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED **RECEIVED**

01-184

From: Mark Schoenbaum
To: Mike Powell
Date: Tue, Apr 15, 2003 11:47 PM
Subject: Wireless number portability

MAY - 5 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Chairman Powell,

I feel that as a consumer it is my responsibility to write you with my opinion regarding wireless number portability. Although I am happy with the service and pricing I currently receive from my wireless provider, I am also well aware that if I desire to change providers for any reason that I would have to consider the ramifications of making everyone that I have given my current mobile phone number to aware that I have changed providers and therefore phone numbers. Also being involved in business management, I would have to say that this imposition is event worse in the business environment where market presence is paramount and a customer reaching a disconnected number would most likely find another vendor. These issues are sufficient enough to prevent me, and quite a number of consumers, from casually switching providers. I feel that this issue alone is enough to prevent normal market competition and should therefore warrant regulations meant to allow consumers full number portability. Please ensure that that these type of regulations are implemented and that special interests are not allowed to derail this issue through the courts or through political influence.

Thank You,

- Mark Schoenbaum

Mark Schoenbaum
Chief Technology Officer
Spot Systems, Inc.
(415) 982-8150 x217 bus. / (415) 722-1248 mobile
marks@spotsystems.com

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List A B C D E

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

01-184

From: Evan Wilkoff
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner
Adelstein
Date: Wed, Apr 16, 2003 11:43 AM
Subject: Wireless Number Portability

RECEIVED

MAY - 5 2003

Chairman and Commissioners:

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

For whatever it is worth, I would like to chime in on the continuing saga of wireless number portability.

It is obvious that the carriers do not want this regulation as they will lose significant leverage over their captive customers (captive - since telephone numbers have commercial value in this electronic age). It is also clear that consumers would probably only benefit from having a choice of carriers once their contracts are up for renewal.

I strongly urge you to allow the regulation to start as planned this November (after much delay) and allow the carriers to compete on price, equipment, coverage and service as most other companies in this economy.

As I live in the suburban Philadelphia market, I would probably stay with my current carrier (Verizon) as they seem to have the best coverage in the markets that I frequent. But I would (and should) like to have a choice.

After all, it is the public's airwaves that are being used for a commercial enterprise - the FCC should regulate them in a manner that is pro-consumer while providing the carriers an opportunity to earn a reasonable profit. Based on my understanding of this issue, Wireless Number Portability will still allow for a healthy market.

Respectfully,

Evan Wilkoff

764 Holly Road

Wayne, PA 19087

610-688-2371

Evan.Wilkoff@verizon.net

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List A B C D E

01-184

From: Jon Thompson
To: Mike Powell
Date: 4/10/03 6:49AM
Subject: Re: Mobile Number Portability

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

Director Powell,

When I purchased my cell phone, it was the better phone in my home town, which has bad reception (I've had the "can you hear me now" guys out here several times). 6 months ago, a competitor installed a tower a mile out of town.

My cellphone is my business phone, which means that I cannot change the number easily, but I am changing the service as soon as this law gets implemented.

This law is not a regulation of "convenience", as said by one wireless vendor in the Washington Post. This law is a check and balance to better competition, and can only better serve the public.

Sincerely,

Jon Thompson
Jon Thompson Consulting
(515) 360-0250
jon@mac-consultant.com

706 South Main
Woodward, IA
50276

RECEIVED

MAY - 5 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List A B C D E

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

01-184

From: M Ray
To: Mike Powell
Date: 4/10/03 10:35PM
Subject: Number Portability

RECEIVED

MAY - 5 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Mr. Powell,

It has come to my attention, that at least one(1) company is, once again, asking for a delay to Number Portability.

If true, this would be the fourth such delay, requested and granted.

It has been many years since the entire issue of Number Portability was brought up. The deadlines have come and gone. It is time for the telecommunications to implement .

There should be no questions about time, they've had plenty of time to be aware that Number Portability was coming.

The technology exists for Number Portability to occur. I have been paying for Number Portability, so they telecommunications companies appear very happy to collect my money. They just appear unhappy to provide the service.

I want Number Portability. Companies have been happy to tell me about Number Portability and "too bad it wasn't available yet." It is time for the companies to meet their requirements.

They've had plenty of time. They've know the deadline was coming. No more delays. It time to give the consumers what they have been promised, and what they have been paying for.

Sincerely

Cecil Lee
PO Box 1335
Newark, CA 94560

Ad astra per aspera

Mantas DO Fly

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List A B C D E

From: Larry Lorenz
To: Mike Powell
Date: 4/14/03 5:06PM
Subject: Number Portability Charges

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

MAY - 5 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Mr. Powell,

I was just informed by ATT wireless that I would be charged a \$1.75 per month fee for number portability and I have this fee on my land line too. This is an erroneous fee that we have no say in, and ATT says the FCC mandates it. It's a BS fee because it's a charge for a supposed service that we may take advantage of in the future. I know for a fact though, if someone moves to a new area code or state you cannot have the number you had before and the fee will not be refunded, which could amount into hundreds of dollars over time. For what? Absolutely nothing in return. It's only a fee for a possibility. That's like Ford Motor Company charging you a fee for the possibility of buying a car from them in the future. Ridiculous isn't it? Personally, I think phone companies are taking advantage of this mandate by the FCC to impose unnecessary charges that increase their bottom line. Don't get me wrong, I don't mind paying for services I receive in kind; but, this is ludicrous. A better way would be a one time fee at the time one moves and decides to keep their original phone number. I can't believe I am the only one who protests this and it would seem to me that if the FCC is at the heart of this then you can do something to remedy this situation short of a class action suit.

Regards, Larry Lorenz

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List A B C D E _____

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

01-184

From: Dru Nelson
To: Mike Powell
Date: 4/15/03 5:02PM
Subject: number portability

RECEIVED

MAY - 5 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

I think number portability should be a requirement of the cellular providers. They tend to always have these long contracts and the service isn't that good.

I read on slashdot about a guy in England's experience. Essentially, he can switch providers in an hour. I think our cellular providers should be able to pull this off (with a few other things on the list as well). They are stifling the competition.

I just read about this in a wireless newsletter, I am not affiliated with the providers or any other group.

dru

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List A B C D E